

Serial No. 10/724,333

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 1 was originally objected to because of some informalities.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended according to the Examiner's instruction, and it is believed that the objections should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-8 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Park (5,682,621).

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 9 and 10 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Leblanc et al. (3,896,496).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claims 9-11 are deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 9-11 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1-8 and 12 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Wen-Hsiung Wu

Dated: January 17, 2006.

By


Alan D. Kamrath
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.
Attorneys for Applicant
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820 International Centre
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 392-7306
Facsimile: (612) 349-6556